



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,929	11/21/2003	John M. Forsythe	1957-6012.1US	4005
24247	7590	04/15/2008		
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			EXAMINER HYUN, PAUL SANG HWA	
			ART UNIT 1797	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/15/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOMail@traskbritt.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/719,929	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FORSYTHE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PAUL S. HYUN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/04/08</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 and 15-21 are currently pending. Applicant amended claims 1 and 12.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 2 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim, or amend the claim to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim in independent form.

Claim 1 recites all the limitations recited in claim 2. Specifically, claim 1 already recites the step of comparing the amount of internal standard at the chemical testing facility with the initial amount of internal standard.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims **1-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 2 and 11 recite the limitation "the second location". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims **1-13 and 15-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peck (US 5,358,851) in view of Anton et al. (US 2001/0053517 A1).

Peck discloses a method for quantitatively analyzing chemicals [e.g. 2-methylnaphthalene (see line 36, col. 2)] in soil (see lines 1-17, col. 6). The method comprises the steps of:

- a) providing a kit comprising an adsorbent (e.g. charcoal), buffers and standards (see lines 5-10, col. 6 and lines 58-61, col. 5);
- b) using the adsorbent to collect a sample (e.g. soil) (see lines 5-10, col. 6);
- c) extracting hydrocarbons from the sample by using an extraction solution;
- d) transporting the container to a gas chromatograph; and
- e) quantitatively measuring the amount of extracted hydrocarbons (see Example 4, col. 11).

The method disclosed by Peck differs from the claimed invention in that Peck does not disclose the use of an internal standard.

Anton et al. disclose a kit for collecting and analyzing an unknown sample. The kit comprises a known quantity of internal standard that is used to “spike” the sample when the sample is collected. The internal standard is used to determine the natural degradation of the sample from the time the sample is collected and the sample is analyzed (see [0007]). This is accomplished by obtaining the ratio of the quantity of the internal standard at the time of sample analysis and the known quantity of internal standard used to spike the sample (see [0022]). In light of the disclosure of Anton et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the kit disclosed by Peck with an internal standard to account for the natural degradation of the sample.

With respect to claim 6, Peck discloses the step of recording information about the sample (see line 57, col. 9). Although the recorded information is absorbance readings from a spectrophotometer, it would have been obvious to record the gas chromatograph results as well. Furthermore, the reference discloses conducting a regression analysis of the data produced by the gas chromatograph (see Example 4, col. 11). Based on the disclosure, it is evident that information about the sample analyzed via gas chromatography is recorded. Otherwise, a regression analysis could not be conducted.

With respect to claims 7, 8 and 12, 13 and 15-21, neither Peck nor Anton et al. disclose the analysis of a tuber for the claimed chemicals. However, given that the method in Peck is directed towards the analysis of samples that are consumed by

humans [i.e. soil, water and air (see lines 5-15, col. 6)] for contaminants, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the modified method disclosed by Peck to analyze other consumable samples such as tubers that absorb deleterious chemicals. Likewise, it would have been obvious to rinse the tuber sample prior to analysis to remove dirt and other analytes of non-interest, and it would have been obvious to analyze only a section of the tuber to minimize the time and ingredients used for the analysis.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the art rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL S. HYUN whose telephone number is (571)272-8559. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571)-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul S Hyun/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/Jill Warden/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797